

REMARKS

Claim 16 has been amended to effect a minor editorial change.

New claim 21 has been added corresponding to claim 16 but dependent upon claim 2.

New claims 22-23 have been added directed to a solid polymer-type fuel cell comprising the separator according to claim 16.


Regarding the Advisory Action, the Examiner has indicated that the Applicant's last Rule 132 Declaration is not persuasive because the Applicant did not use materials of the prior art in the comparison. Any differences between the materials of the prior art and the alternate materials used in the comparative experiments conducted by the Applicant are inconsequential. Regarding the Examiner's comments about the modifier, a polyisocyanate was used in the prior art. Such compound is not a polymer as stated by the Examiner. The term "polyisocyanate" is a generic name for a compound which has a plurality of isocyanate groups in one molecule. Therefore diphenylmethane-4-4'-diisocyanate used in the comparative experiments is a polyisocyanate as used in the prior art.

In summary, the Applicant has expended considerable effort and expense to conduct a comparison as suggested by the Examiner during the last personal interview. Any deviations in materials between the prior art and the alternate materials used by the Applicant in the comparative examples are inconsequential. The comparative experiments clearly demonstrate the remarkable and unexpected properties of the molded product obtained from the claimed composition when compared with the molded product of Butler '308.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroya OKUMURA et al.

By: 
Warren M. Cheek, Jr.
Registration No. 33,367
Attorney for Applicants

WMC/dlk
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 21, 2005